

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application.

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,286,038 issued to Reichmeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,422 issued to Hunter et al.

Claim 1 recites the following:

dynamically obtaining by the client device at least one alert detection parameter from a first server;

dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote alert proxy using the at least one obtained alert detection parameter; and

automatically configuring the client device using the dynamically obtained configuration data.

Claims 11, 19, and 22 recite similar limitations.

Reichmeyer discloses a method of remotely configuring a network device. Reichmeyer discloses that a server may function to direct a network device to a configuration file based on an identifier supplied with a discover message (see col. 6, lines 7-13). Reichmeyer further discloses that the configuration parameters returned from the client from the server may include the location of a configuration file, and upon receipt of information indicating this location, a client may initiate an automatic file transfer operation to retrieve the configuration file (see col. 4, lines 38-43). None of this text in Reichmeyer (that is cited in the Office Action) discloses an alert proxy or an alert detection parameter. Therefore, Reichmeyer does not disclose dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote alert proxy using the at least one obtained alert detection parameter. These limitations are recited in claims 1, 11, 19, and 22.

Hunter discloses a facilities monitoring and control intranet comprising one or more client devices in communication with a server. Hunter discloses that all rules for controlling each piece of facilities equipment are provided by the server to each client device, when requested, and all rules for monitoring each piece of facilities equipment are programmed to, and remain resident and operational on, each client (see col. 4, lines 11-16). This text in Hunter (which is cited in the Office Action) does not mention an alert proxy or an alert detection parameter. Therefore, Hunter does not disclose dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote **alert proxy** using the at least one obtained **alert detection parameter**. Thus, Hunter does not cure the deficiencies of Reichmeyer.

Neither Hunter nor Reichmeyer disclose an alert proxy or an alert detection parameter. Therefore, no combination of Hunter and Reichmeyer can disclose dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote alert proxy using the at least one obtained alert detection parameter. These limitations are recited in claims 1, 11, 19, and 22. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 11, 19, and 22 are patentable over Hunter and Reichmeyer.

Claims 2, 5-10, 12-17, 20, and 24 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-10, 12-17, 20, and 24 are patentable over Hunter and Reichmeyer for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 3, 4, 18, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,286,038 issued to Reichmeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,422 issued to Hunter et al. as applied to claims 1, 2, 5-17, 19, 20, 22, and 24, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,854 issued to Cromer et al.

As discussed above, neither Hunter nor Reichmeyer discloses dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote alert proxy using the at least one obtained alert detection parameter. These limitations are recited in claims 1, 11, 19, and 22.

Cromer discloses an automatic configuration system. The Office Action states that Cromer discloses a means for enabling a client device to detect alerts while the device is in a reduced functional state. Whether or not Cromer discloses this feature, Cromer does not disclose dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote alert proxy using the at least one obtained alert detection parameter. Therefore, Cromer does not cure the deficiencies of Hunter and Reichmeyer. No combination of Cromer, Hunter, and Reichmeyer discloses dynamically obtaining configuration data from a remote alert proxy using the at least one obtained alert detection parameter, as recited in claims 1, 11, 19, and 22. Therefore, claims 1, 11, 19, and 22 are patentable over Cromer, Hunter, and Reichmeyer.

Claims 3, 4, 18, 21, and 23 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 18, 21, and 23 are patentable over Cromer, Hunter, and Reichmeyer for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 11/11/03

Lisa Tom
Lisa Tom
Reg. No. 52,291

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

11/11/03

Date of Deposit

Annie Pearson

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Annie Pearson

Signature

11/11/03

Date